

REMARKS

I. Introduction.

Claims 1-17 are pending, and stand rejected. The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first and second paragraphs. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b). Claims 10 - 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103.

II. The Objection to the Drawings.

The Office Action indicates that a purifying device and the spraying device attached to a hose, wherein water is passed through the hose into the purifying device and then sprayed by the spraying device must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from Claims 11-14 and 16-17.

A proposed informal drawing sheet showing these features is submitted herewith. Entry of the drawing sheet is respectfully requested.

III. The 35 U.S.C. Section 112 Rejections.

A. The Section 112, First Paragraph Rejections.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a cleaning composition comprising a polymer which is capable of rendering the surface hydrophilic, does not provide enablement for any type of cleaning composition which renders the surface hydrophilic.

The Applicants expressly disagree with the statements that the specification is non-enabling for cleaning compositions comprising substances other than polymers. However, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to specify that the cleaning composition comprises a polymer which renders the surface hydrophilic. The Applicants may elect to pursue claims directed to cleaning compositions comprising substances other than polymers in a continuing application.

B. The Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejections.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 have also been amended to provide that the polymer renders the surface hydrophilic to eliminate the rejection surrounding the use of the phrase "capable of."

Claim 3 has been amended to address the indefiniteness rejection by simply specifying that the surface is rinsed with water.

Claims 8 and 12 have been amended to use proper Markush language.

Claim 12 has also been amended for clarification.

Claim 14 has been amended to clarify the same.

IV. The 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) Rejections.

A. The Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 4-9.

Claims 1-2 and 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by PCT Publication WO 98/36046 published in the name of Gordon, et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the claimed cleaning composition has a pH of less than 9. The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn since Gordon, et al. is directed to liquid hard surface cleaning compositions which have a pH above 9.

Claim 2 has been amended to clarify that it is the soiled surface that is pre-wetted. The Applicants respectfully disagree that there is anything on page 10, third paragraph of the Gordon, et al. reference that applies to Claim 2, as amended. This paragraph merely describes a test method for testing the neat cleaning performance of the composition described in the Gordon, et al. reference. This paragraph says nothing about pre-wetting after the surface is soiled.

Claims 4-9 are directly or indirectly dependent from Claim 1. Since the subject matter of Claim 1 is not taught or disclosed in the Gordon, et al. reference, Claims 4-9 are also distinguishable from Gordon, et al.

B. The Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, and 9.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,294,729 issued to Bakos, et al.

U.S. Patent 4,294,729 issued to Bakos, et al. is directed to a composition containing alcohol and the use thereof for epoxy removal from an integrated circuit. Bakos, et al. require that the composition comprise a major amount of organic cyclic alcohol (preferably at least about 60% by weight) that boils above about 110°C and a minor amount of a surface active agent. The compositions described in Bakos, et al. are preferably substantially, if not completely, free from water. (Col. 7, lines 17-18.)

The rejection based on the Bakos, et al. reference is not proper for several reasons. Bakos, et al. does not teach or disclose rendering a surface hydrophilic. With respect to Claim 4, the Bakos, et al. composition would not be suitable for use on many of the surfaces described therein. For example, if the Bakos, et al. composition were applied on top of the clear coat on the exterior surface of a vehicle, the composition described in Bakos, et al. would likely solubilize and damage the clear coat. Further, with respect to Claims 5-7, the examiner has not pointed to any teaching or disclosure of the claimed contact angles in the Bakos, et al. reference. It is not inherent that certain compositions will modify a surface to provide the surface with the specified contact angles.

Claim 1, however, has been amended to specify that the claimed cleaning composition is aqueous. As noted above, the Bakos, et al. compositions are substantially, if not completely, free from water. The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

V. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103(b) Rejections.

A. The Rejection of Claim 10.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,928,065 issued to Savino.

Savino discloses a composition for cleaning metal cookware. The composition comprises a mixture of kaolin and a solvent which is N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone, N-ethyl-pyrrolidone, N-isopropyl-2-pyrrolidone, or 2-amino-2-methyl-1-propanol, or mixtures thereof. Savino states that food debris may easily be removed from metal cookware by contacting the debris with the mixture followed by soaking in hot water, and rinsing. As indicated at the top of Col. 2 of the Savino reference, "[m]ixtures of kaolin and solvent within the ratios in accordance with the present invention are free flowing and are in fine particulate form, and tend to be somewhat dusty." (Col. 2, lines 4-7.) The Office Action states that it is prima facie obviousness to combine two compositions, each taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition which is to be used for the very same purpose.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Contrary to the statements in the Office Action, it would not have been obvious to have modified the method of Gordon, et al. to include kaolin as taught by Savino without having referred to the disclosure of the Applicants' pending application. The composition described in Gordon, et al. can be applied using a sprayer. The composition described in

Savino is applied to metal cookware in a completely different manner -- by contacting the debris on the metal cookware with the mixture followed by soaking in hot water, and rinsing. The steps in the Gordon, et al. and Savino references are completely different, and it would not be clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art how to modify the processes described in these two different references (one of which involves contacting a surface with dusty particles, and the other which involves spraying a liquid) in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

B. The Rejection of Claims 11-12 and 14-17.

Claims 11-12 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan.

The Office Action indicates that Gordon fails to teach purifying the rinse water by using an ion-exchange resin. The Office Action states that with respect to Claims 11-12, Cahan teaches an ion-exchange resin used in car washes for purposes of reducing the water hardness.

As set forth above, Gordon, et al. is directed to liquid hard surface cleaning compositions which have a pH above 9. Cahan, et al. does not specify the pH of the wash composition used therein. The combination of references cited does not teach or disclose a process for cleaning a surface comprising first contacting the surface with an aqueous cleaning composition having a pH of less than 9, said cleaning composition comprising a polymer which renders the surface hydrophilic, and then rinsing the surface with purified rinse water. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 11-12 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Office Action states that "in view of the indefiniteness of claim 14, the limitations are met by Cahan." Claim 14 has been amended to make it clear that purifying device produces a visual indication of depletion of the ion exchange resin. The combination of references cited does not teach or disclose the use of purifying device that produces a visual indication of depletion of the ion exchange resin.

C. The Rejection of Claim 13.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,502,215 issued to Cahan, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,284,124 issued to DiMascio, et al.

The Office Action states that Gordon, et al. as modified by Cahan teaches the invention substantially as claimed with the exception of three layers of ion exchange resin. The Office Action states that DiMascio, et al. teaches a deionization apparatus comprising multiple alternating layers of ion exchange resin material for the purpose of providing high purity deionized water.

DiMascio, et al. is directed to an electrodeionization apparatus and method. The electrodeionization apparatus includes an ion-depleting compartment having alternating layers of ion exchange resin material.

As set forth above, Gordon, et al. is directed to liquid hard surface cleaning compositions which have a pH above 9. Cahan, et al. does not specify the pH of the wash composition used therein. DiMascio, et al. does not disclose any type of cleaning composition. The combination of references cited does not teach or disclose a process for cleaning a surface comprising first contacting the surface with an aqueous cleaning composition having a pH of less than 9, said cleaning composition comprising a polymer which renders the surface hydrophilic, and then rinsing the surface with purified rinse water. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 13 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

VI. Summary.

Drawings are presented herewith to address the objections to the same. The 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first and second paragraph rejections have been addressed, as have the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 103. In view of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BRUCE BARGER, ET AL.

By



Jeffrey V. Bamber
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 31,148
(513) 627-4597